

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application, as claims 20-24 have been canceled in view of the restriction requirement. Applicants reserve the right to file the canceled claims in a divisional application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6 and 8-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0177267 to Orava, et al. (Orava) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0090929 to Laux, et al. (Laux). In addition, claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orava in view of Laux and further in view well-known prior art. Finally, claim 7 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Independent claim 1 has been amended by clarifying that a scan start time is set for a neighboring access point or mobile device based on entries in the updated site timing table. Independent claim 14 has been similarly amended. Support for the amendments can be found on page 8, lines 25-28 and page 18, lines 25-29. No new matter has been added in view of the amendments.

Orava simply does not describe such a process. Moreover, in paragraph 0114, Laux describes setting an internal timer based on a beacon from the current serving access point, not neighboring access points. The process of setting internal timers based on beacons from a serving (current) access point is well known in the art, and does not contemplate the technique now recited in the claims above. Setting scan start times based on neighboring access points or mobile devices can permit the handset scanning the channels to conserve power, as it knows when to wake up for the beacon or gratuitous probe response scans.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the above claims are now patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 16, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department – MD 1610  
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.  
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Larry G. Brown/  
Larry G. Brown

Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295  
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871